DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 005 EC 211 802

AUTHOR Dick, Marlene A.; And Others
TITLE Building Bridges: Technical Report on Strategies for Parent-Professional Collaboration Training for Transition.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Education Transition Center.
PUB DATE 88
GRANT ETC-a.2.2
NOTE 93p.; For related document, see EC 211 801.
AVAILABLE FROM Resources in Special Education (RiSE), 650 University Ave., Room 201, Sacramento, CA 95825.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Planning; Coordination; *Disabilities; Education Work Relationship; Needs Assessment; *Parent Education; Parent Participation; Parent Workshops; *Professional Training; Program Development; Secondary Education; *Training Methods; *Transitional Programs

ABSTRACT

This project was designed to identify effective parent/professional collaborative training strategies related to transition. Following a review of the literature on collaborative efforts, methodology is presented for a survey of 36 programs. The survey addressed four key areas: elements related to the type and level of training, demographic information, implementation strategies, and effectiveness. Answers to the 35 survey questions are explained in both chart and narrative form. Essential training strategies derived from analysis of the survey data are then presented, and include: assessment of training needs, consideration of planning team membership, training that goes beyond an awareness level to the level of implementation, use of local parent and professional networking, identification of demographic variables, provision of workshops and follow-up activities, development of appropriate materials, and sensitization of parents to the needs of professionals and professionals to the needs of parents. Strategies unique to a small number of effective training programs include such things as hiring members of under-represented populations to act as outreach staff and paying parents to attend training. Appendices contain a copy of the survey form, a sample needs assessment, and information about the survey participants' programs. (JDD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED302005

# Building Bridges:

## Technical Report on Strategies for Parent-Professional Collaboration Training for Transition

**A Project Conducted by:**

Marlene A. Dick, Ed.D.
Lois Moulin, Ph.D.
Susan Pellegrini, Ph.D.
Jerri Traub, Ph.D.

**For:**

California State Department of Education
Education Transition Center
Dr. Patricia Kearly, Coordinator
Sacramento, California

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Winget
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 211802

# Building Bridges:

## Technical Report on Strategies for Parent-Professional Collaboration Training for Transition

**Grant Number: a . 2 . 2**

**Education Transition Center**

Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit
California State Department of Education
Special Education Division
Sacramento, California
1988

# Building Bridges:

## Technical Report on Strategies for Parent-Professional Collaboration Training for Transition

**Education Transition Center**

Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit
California State Department of Education
Special Education Division
Sacramento, California

This publication was funded by the Education Transition Center (ETC) under the direction of the Program, Curriculum, and Training Unit, Special Education Division, California State Department of Education.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the publisher. Copies of this publication are available from Resources in Special Education (RiSE) 650 University Avenue, Room 201, Sacramento 95825.

© Copyright 1988 by Education Transition Center.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


1. Acknowledgements ..... 1
2. Introduction ..... 2
3. Literature Review ..... 3
4. Methodology ..... 10
5. Results ..... 12
6. Essential Strategies for Effective Training ..... 27
7. Unique Strategies ..... 32
8. References ..... 34
9. Appendices
   - A. Survey Form ..... 35
   - B. Sample Needs Assessment ..... 43
   - C. Survey Participants ..... 46
   - D. Survey Non-Participants ..... 64
10. Addendum ..... 66

## Acknowledgements

The authors of this grant wish to acknowledge the following individuals for their contributions:

Parent Review Team:

Vivian D. Fleming

Jim Forderer

Valerie Harris

Lavelle Souza

Rob Wurzbach

Joanne Ybarra

Grant Manager: Ms. Heather Kaney

Education Transition Center

California Department of Education

## Introduction

The proliferation of parent training programs in the United States attests to the expanded role of parents in the education and transition process for "at risk" students (National Information Center for Handicapped Children & Youth, 1983). The purposes of these training programs range from teaching parents about special education laws, parent's and children's rights, teaching methods and curriculum to teaching parents and professionals to work collaboratively in the development and implementation of a students' Individualized Education Plan (IEP) and Individualized Transition Plan (ITP) (Darling, 1983; Moon & Beal, 1984; Horton, Maddox and Edgar, 1984; Hegenauer, Marinoble, Reifman, and Patton, 1985). The increased emphasis on parent participation in the process of transition warranted this project designed to identify effective parent/professional collaborative training strategies related to transition.

## Definitions and Background

In the broadest sense, transition refers to an individual's adaptations to changing roles, locations, and/or relationships in everyday life. Transition may include several stages: transition from hospital to home, from infancy to toddler, from home to preschool, from elementary to junior high or junior high to secondary school, and finally, transition from school to work and adult life. In recent years, the transition of students with disabilities from school to work and adult/community life has become a national concern to educators, parents, advocates, and adult service providers (community agencies responsible for mental health, day programs, supported work, and residential, leisure, recreation, and rehabilitation services).

In 1983, Congress recognized the numerous educational and employment problems experienced by handicapped youth when they left high school to enter the working world. Rusch and Phelps (1987) noted that historically individuals with disabilities often have not been successful in making the transition to the community. Most of them either worked in sheltered settings, were unemployed, or underemployed...(p.491). Congress responded to this issue by passing legislation which was "designed to assist handicapped young people in their efforts to enter the labor force or attain their goals of becoming self-sufficient adults and contributing members to our society" (Section 626, P.L 98-199 -"Secondary Education and Transition Services for Handicapped Youth").

One of the purposes of Section 626 was to "strengthen and coordinate education, training, and related services to assist in the transition process to post-secondary education, vocational training, competitive employment, continuing education or adult services" (Rusch & Phelps, 1987, p. 489). In Section 626, OSERS was authorized to spend $6.6 million dollars to meet this objective. In 1984 and 1985, federal monies funded several grant programs designed to assist handicapped youth in the transition process by supporting secondary education programs and transitional services.

Madeleine Will, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), defined transition as:

> a period that includes high school, the point of graduation, additional post-secondary education or adult services and the the initial years in employment... a bridge between the security and structure offered by the school and the opportunities and risks of adult life... (Programs for the Handicapped, 1984, p.1)

The focus on employment is central to programming for transition. In recent years there has been an increased emphasis on the development and strengthening of programs designed to enhance the transition of handicapped youth from school to work. Wehman, Kregel, and Barcus (1985) focused on the vocational aspect of the transition process. They defined vocational transition as:

> a carefully planned process, which may be initiated by school personnel or adult service providers, to establish and implement a plan for either employment or additional vocational training of a handicapped student who will graduate or leave school in 3 to 5 years; such a process must involve special educators, vocational educators, parents and/or the student, an adult service system representative and possibly an employer (p.26).

Implied in both definitions offered by Will (1984) and Wehman et al. (1985) is the notion that successful transition is the shared responsibility of all parties involved in the process. In California transition refers to:

> a purposeful, organized and outcome-oriented process designed to help every "at risk" student move from school to employment and a quality adult life.
> (California Department of Education, 1987).

Collaborative Efforts

A review of recent literature has evidenced a consensus of opinion that "the best preparation for an independent and employment-outcome-oriented life is brought about through the collaborative efforts of educators, parents, and adult service providers". (Halloran, Thomas, Snauwaert, & DeStefano, 1987, p.2).

Parents play a critical role in their child's educational programming. Goodall and Bruder (1986) view parental involvement as an essential component in the transition process for several reasons. These researchers have described parents as "the greatest resource in helping to develop their child's employment potential, the ultimate advocates and primary case managers and the only planners, besides students, who remain constant in the planning process (p.23). Additionally, parents can offer a unique perspective on the transition goals for their child. When they participate in the formulation of the Individualized Transition Plan (ITP), they contribute their knowledge and ability to project the short-term and long-term needs for their child and themselves into the development of an appropriate transition plan.

Parents are expected to participate in the development of the ITP which is incorporated into the student's legally mandated IEP. Parents must be provided opportunities to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to effectively participate in the transition process. Horton, Maddox, and Edgar (1984) found that effective parent participation was enhanced by parent-education activities that addressed the specific needs and questions

of parents. They suggested the following strategies be used in training parents to be effective advocates:

1. Orient parents to community agencies providing post school services
2. Familiarize parents with the specific responsibilities of special education, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and adult service programs
3. Prepare parents to work with various agencies to develop transition plans and to apply for future services

(p.3)

The WorkAbility Parent Involvement Committee (1986) conducted a survey of parents to determine effective strategies for enhancing parental involvement in their child's educational programming. The results of this survey indicated that parent-professional personal contact was the most effective strategy. Various approaches to parent training which are currently being used include information networks and referral services designed to increase parents' awareness of available services, training in behavior modification techniques, respite care services, self-help/support groups, university credit courses, and workshops and mini-courses related to transition.

Concentrated efforts in collaboration by professionals and parents are crucial to the development of effective interventions which will lead to the successful transition of students with disabilities. Although the importance of parent-professional collaboration is well recognized, the literature revealed few programs in which parents and professionals are actually trained

together. The level of parental involvement in most training programs appears to be that parents provide input relative to their training needs and suggest topics about which they would like to learn, and professionals respond to these needs by teaching these topics to parents.

The paucity of information related to parent-professional collaborative training programs for the transition of students with disabilities provided the impetus for this project. The purpose of the project was to develop a manual which represents effective strategies used in parent-professional training for transition practices. It is hoped that the information included in this manual will assist parents and professionals planning and implementing collaborative training programs for the transition of individuals with special needs.

Note:

The authors of this report recognize that parents are professionals. However in order to differentiate the two groups for purpose of exploring the extent of collaboration between parents and professionals, we have elected to use the term "parent" to indicate that the individual's primary role vis-a-vis the person served by the transition training programs is the "parent of a child or young adult with special needs."

## Methodology

In the Spring of 1987 the Education Transition Center, California State Department of Education funded a project aimed at conducting a national review of parent/professional collaborative training for transition programs. The purpose of the review was to identify and survey 50 programs, to collect and analyze data from these programs to determine practices and strategies which produced quality collaborative training. The principal investigators identified the initial 50 programs in May, 1987 by reviewing current literature, conducting an ERIC search, requesting contacts through SpecialNet, and contacting leaders in the field.

This initial search produced the names of 50 programs listed in Appendices C & D. All 50 programs were contacted by telephone in June, 1987 to obtain primary information concerning: a) the nature of the program, b) the population served, c) the type of collaboration, and d) the type of transition. Appendices C & D contain the primary information received from the programs. The representatives of the programs were also asked if they would be available to participate in an in-depth telephone survey in July, 1987.

The four principal investigators and two parent specialists developed the survey form in June, 1987. The survey was designed to address four key areas:

1) The elements of the training i.e., type and level of training, length, schedule, topics addressed, who conducted and participated in the training, where it was held, cost;

2) demographic information, i.e. age group and types of disabled populations benefiting from training, geographic area served, language, ethnic, educational and economic background of participants.

3) implementation strategies, i.e. recruitment, planning strategies, instructional or other strategies during training, post training strategies, parent input, advisory board involvement, follow-up activities, evaluation techniques and results;

4) effectiveness, i.e. the perceived effect on parents, students, and professionals, the goals and outcomes of the program, the most effective elements of the program, ancillary activities of the program and their importance related to training, and future plans.

The survey was revised after consultation with parent specialists. A 35 item survey was sent to each of the identified 50 training programs in late June (see appendix A for survey) with a cover letter indicating the scheduled time of the in-depth phone interview. The survey was sent prior to the interview to allow participants time to prepare responses. A telephone interview was conducted to ensure an adequate number of responses in a limited amount of time and to allow investigators to ask additional questions related to unique elements or strategies of the programs surveyed. Data were collected from 36 programs through the telephone surveys (see appendix C). Fourteen programs, were excluded because the goals and/or training programs were not appropriate for this research (i.e., not involved in transition or collaborative training, or the programs were unable to complete the phone survey (see appendix D).

## Results

The data from the 36 programs were reviewed by the investigators in late July and are illustrated in Table 1. Due to the inherent nature of telephone survey methodology and/or the number of open ended questions, results in some cases do not talley to the N of 36 or tallied to more than 36 when multiple responses were given.

Question # 1

"What type of transition training do you do?"

Responses to this question yielded four types of training models: a) a workshop initiated with awareness activities using a lecture format followed by small group discussion and applied activities; b) an orientation meeting; c) one to one parent training with no formal group meeting; and d) a trainer of trainers model whereby a group of parents is trained by professionals or professionals and parents. These parents become trainers for other parents.

Question # 2

"If you do workshops, who are the participants?"

The 36 respondents indicated that 8 (22%) held workshops for parents only, while 22 (61%) held workshops for mixed groups of parents and professionals. Eighteen (50%) of the projects included agency personnel, 17 (47%) included vocational personnel, only 3 (8%) of the 36 projects included students in the transition training workshops. One project included group home personnel as workshop participants, one included lawyers and school board members and two included employers.

Question # 3

"If you do transition training, who conducts the training?"

Workshops were conducted by professionals in 14, (39%) programs or by professionals and parents together in 12, (33%) programs. Only 9 (25%) of the workshops were conducted by parents without assistance from professionals.

Question # 4

"Who planned the training?"

The data suggest that even when the parents conducted the workshop, professionals were involved in the planning for the training. Seventeen (47%) of the projects stated that workshops were planned by professionals, 12 (33%) were planned by a mixed group of parents and professioanals, and 5 (14%) of the projects reported that workshops were planned by parents.

Question # 5

"At what level would you describe your training?"

The intensity of the training was determined through a forced choice question. All of the projects reported training at the "awareness" level; 37 (97%) reported training at the "knowledge" level; 25 (69%) trained at the "practice/skill acquistiion" level; and 22 (61%) provided training at the "implementation" level.

Question # 6

"What is the length of training and the most effective time schedule for training?"

Time and scheduling for transition training varied from a single, four-hour session on a weekday evening to two full days of training during one weekend

or on a consecutive Saturdays. Some of the projects used more than one time-schedule format to accommodate participants. Sixteen (44%) of the projects presented workshops on weekday evenings; 13 (36%) projects trained on a Saturday; 13 (36%) trained on a weekday; 2 (5%) projects presented 2 day training sessions; and 2 projects had individual ongoing training with no formal group meetings. Twenty six (72%) programs conducted a "one shot" training. 11 (31%) programs provided a series of training, and 7 (19%) scheduled training based on the interest/needs of participants.

Question # 7

"What are the transition areas/topics addressed?"

This open ended question revealed both a commonality and a diversity of topics based on the purpose of the project. Information about the laws, agencies and services, and the IEP and/or ITP process were common to almost all of the projects. The two projects which included students in the training reported that they presented information regarding student self-management and self-advocacy. The infant transition training project listed medical issues and Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) as topics of training. The projects which adhered to the trainer of trainers model included topics related to planning, organizing and implementing the training.

Question # 8

"How was the training conducted?"

Twenty one (58%) of the projects reported using the lecture format for transition training. Seventeen (47%) used a workshop, 11 (31%) used an experiential format, and 4 (11%) indicated that they used one-on-one training.

Question # 9

"Where was the training held?"

Respondents indicated that community sites (churches, community centers, libraries, and hotels) were the most popular places to hold trainings; 28 (78%) of the trainings were held in community sites, 21 (58%) were held in schools, and 11 (30%) were held in private homes. The geography and size of the group and resources available often dictated the training site.

Question # 10

"How long has your program been in existence?"

The responses to this question indicated that several projects had served parents' and professionals' training needs for several years and recently initiated special training modules regarding transition issues. Only one project has been involved in transition training for more than three years. Ten (28%) of the projects included transition training for 2-3 years, 15 (42%) for 1-2 years, and 7 (19%) for less than one year.

Question #11

"How many parents/professionals have you trained in total? How many each year?"

The responses to this question ranged from 8 to 600 or more. This range of responses seemed to depend on: available resources, intent of program, length of time program had been in existence, type and degree of follow-up services, target population , etc. Due to these variables, responses could not be compared.

Question #12

"What age groups does this training affect?"

When respondents were asked which age groups the training affects, it was evident that although some projects 6 (16%) considered transition in a comprehensive sense (birth through adult) many 33 (92%) focused on the transition from school to work or community living. One of the 36 projects was devoted specifically to transition from birth to preschool and was basically a "medical/agency services to school model".

Question # 13

"What types of youth does this training affect?"

Although this question did not address the severity of the disability, 8 (22%) of the projects reported serving youth with severe disabilities and 3 (8%) reported serving youth with mild disabilities. Fifteen (42%) of the projects serve all individuals with special needs with the exception of the gifted and talented. Six (17%) of the projects serve all of the youth listed on the questionnaire, 4 (11%) serve all except the gifted/talented and the "at risk youth" and one project serves all "at risk infants".

Question #14

"What is your geographical area?"

Responses to the inquiry regarding geographical area served, reflected the state wide nature of many of the transition training projects. Almost all of the training was conducted in urban areas 30 (84%). Twenty-three projects (64%) reported serving rural areas and 18 (50%) trained in suburban areas.

Question #15

"Are the trainings offered in any language other than English?"

Twelve (33%) of the programs reported training in Spanish. Manual communication (Signing Exact English) was offered by 6 (17%) of the programs. Three (8%) programs used Native American languages, 1 (3%) Laotion and 1 (3%) Vietnamese.

Question #16

"Could you describe the ethnic, economic, and educational background of the participants?"

The ethnic, economic status, and educational make-up of the participants in transition training workshops tends to be Caucasian 35 or 97% programs serve Caucasian families), middle class (30 or 84% of the programs serve middle class families) and high school graduates (29 or 81% programs reported serving primarily high school graduates). Eighteen or 50% of the programs served Black families, 12 or 33% Hispanic families, 11 or 31% Asian families, and 7 or 19% Native American families. One project reported serving French families and one reported serving Russian families. Only 12 or 31% programs described their population as upper class and 20 or 56% programs stated that they reached families from the lower economic status. Eleven or 31% of the participants had post high school education.

Question #17

"Do you conduct an evaluation of each training?"

Twenty five (69%) of the programs or conducted a formal evaluation. Seventeen (47%) stated that they also conducted an informal evaluation.

Question # 18

"Based on the evaluation data, what were the strengths and weaknesses of your program?"

"The responses to this question ranged from satisfaction with content, (i.e., good topics and presentations, useable information) to weaknesses which were a function of too little time, organization, assessment of local needs, and a frustration regarding an inability to reach and serve families representing other than Caucasian ethnic groups. Satisfaction with process (i.e., organized, materials and handouts, dialogue, feeling of support, resources provided, diversity of participants); satisfaction with outcome (i.e., empowers parents, opportunities to network, and interagency contacts and coordination). Some of the weaknesses experienced by the programs were the lack of time, use of information that was too technical/not useable, low turn out, sessions too short, and lack of formal evaluation. (See matrix question #18)

Question #19

"Were there any follow-up activities?" and "Describe any post-training strategies that you used?"

All projects acknowledged the value of follow-up activities. Most reported some method of follow-up; various activities were noted. Nineteen (53%) of the projects surveyed provided post-training phone assistance; one offered a state wide toll-free phone number; 9 (25%) provided one-to-one assistance, often focusing on individual transition planning. Other forms of follow-up included the establishment of local support groups and newsletters, coordination groups, referral assistance, and case management.

Questions #20 and #21

"How much did the training cost?: and "What was the most effective use of your dollar?"

There were no costs involved to participants in any of the programs surveyed. Concerning the most effective use of their dollar, 9 (25%) of the projects reported that an effective use of their funds was for material production, (hand outs or packets of information to training participants). Other programs reported that the following were effective: providing child care 6 (17%), speakers 5 (14%), Staff salaries 4 (11%), release time for professionals 3 (8%), food 3 (8%), and consultants 2 (5%).

Question # 22

"How did you get people to come to the training?" and "How did you keep them involved?"

Several methods were used to recruit participants. Seventeen (47%) of the projects relied on recruiting participants by phone, often making use of local contact or parent-to -parent networks. Five (14%) programs utilized teacher calls to parents as a recruitment technique. Mailers in some form (personal letters, newsletters, bulk mailings to parents through school districts, agencies or established parent organizations) were used by 5 (14%) programs. In 2 instances, professionals, (particularly teachers) were given release time to attend the training sessions. Two programs kept students after school so that their parents could pick up the student after they attended a meeting.

Ongoing contact was given by 27% of the programs as a technique to keep parents involved. Other techniques included: 9% used newsletters, 9% followed up with reminders, 8% required continued involvement of parents, 5% used phone calling or articles, and 2% used flyers.

Question #23

"What do you think the effect of the training was on...?"

Parents

A majority of the programs surveyed, reported that as a result of training parents became more informed consumers, increased their knowledge of services, and became advocates for their children. Parents demonstrated significant attitude and awareness changes; most parents became excited about their expanded role, felt empowered, reported feeling more comfortable and confident, less fearful, anxious and less intimidated by professionals. They felt entitled to services and became more aware of the concept of least restrictive enviroment as well as community based programs and supported work projects. In some instances while parents believed they were entitled to better services, some project coordinators reported parents became frustrated when faced with the reality of limited programs, little cooperation among agencies and the limited availability of community based programs.

Professionals

Professionals also benefited from parent-professional training in many ways. They gained more information regarding the transition process, felt better prepared, more knowledgable regarding services, and some had higher expectations for students. They also acquired strategies, became more involved with special or vocational education, more collaborative, and introduced curriculum changes.

Students

Project coordinators reported that they believed students were more likely to receive services. Others reported that graduates were placed, students had "better" IEPs, students became more informed consumers, and there was better access to services.

Question #24

"What observable outcomes have you noticed?"

A diverse range of outcomes was reported. They included:

- .Better agency cooperation
- .Manual development
- .Journal publication
- .Job coach program developed
- .Disability awareness program in the schools
- .More integrated sites
- .Parent support groups initiated
- .Increased parental involvement in the community and schools (grant writing and lobbying efforts)

Question #25

"What were the goals of your transition program and to what extent have you met these goals?"

Program goals varied widely. In terms of content, 14 (38%) of the programs studied intended to develop an awareness of individual and family needs at different transitional stages in a handicapped person's life; 12 (33%) focused on planning or facilitating transition, or promoting action or change.

Ten programs (28%) focused on providing information about adult services and highlighting the school to work transition period. Five (14%) programs trained students for work in skills, 3 (8%) focused on employing students, and 2 (5%) programs focused on advocacy and integration respectively. One program provided information to parents of infants with special needs on transitioning from hospital to home.

Several state-wide projects intended to provide leadership training to participants to "train trainers" in both the content related to transition and training techniques to work with individuals and groups of parents/professionals. Several projects focused on new community based, supported work opportunities for a young adult population of which the majority of students had severe disabilities and orientation meetings to gain parental support throughout this transition period. All programs reported that goals are in the process of/or are partially being met.

Question # 26

"Do you have a transition advisory board? What is their role? Who makes up the board? How did having a board help?"

Twenty-one (58%) of the programs used an advisory board generally composed of representative parents, professionals and employers. They advise and consult with program staff and assist in planning, coordinating programs, and networking. The programs benefited from the advisory board in primarily two ways: planning 13 (36%) and networking 10 (28%).

Question # 27

"Describe the strategies that you used in planning for the training?" and "Which were the most effective?"

Nineteen (53%) of the projects reported that they conducted needs assessment either by mail or in person and believed it to be an effective planning strategy. Fourteen (39%) programs used groups of parents, staff, and professionals to plan the training; in 8 (22%) programs professionals planned the training alone. Two programs each reported planning collaboratively with agencies, adhering to grant guidelines, developing packets or using materials previously developed.

Question # 28

"Who was responsible for the planning?"

Question #28 was collapsed with question #4. (See question #4 for results)

Question #29

"Describe the strategies used during training, (i.e. instructional techniques, media) and "Which were the most effective?"

Generally, programs reported using a combination of training strategies. Most encouraged participation by involving the audience in discussion and small group activities. They reported those methods to be most effective. Thirteen (36%) used lecture, 12 (33%) programs used audio/visual presentations, 9 (25%) programs used videos, 8 (22%) used pockets of information, 7 (19%) used overheads, and 6 (17%) used role playing. Respondents identified the following strategies to encourage active workshop participation:

.Site visits

.Storytelling and personal sharing

.Panels and guest speakers

.Cooperative learning, and

.Action planning.

Question # 30

"Describe any post training strategies that you used?" and "Which were the most effective?"

Respondents described a variety of follow-up activities. (see # 19).

Question # 31

"What kind of parent input did you have for planning, material development, facilitation/leading, andevaluation/presenting?"

Twenty-one (58%) of all programs reported parent input in all phases of training and development. Parents were involved in planning, developing materials, presenting or facilitating and evaluation. Two projects reported no parental involvement in any phase of training.

Question # 32

"What other activities/services do you provide for parents and professionals?"

Twenty-nine (81%) of the programs reported that they provided additional classes as needed, 28 (77%) provided technical assistance, 27 (75%) produced manuals or handbooks, 26 (72%) provided program referral, 24 (67%) produced a newsletter, 66% provided assistance in developing ITPs, 22 (61%) provided further information and resources, and 20 (56%) assisted support groups. The majority of programs provided a variety of activities and services after training.

Question # 33

"How important do you feel that these activities are/have been in continuing the transition effort started by the parent/professional training?"

Thirty (84%) programs felt these activities were vital, very important, or important.

Question #34

"What do you consider to be the most effective elements of the transition training?"

Several programs cited parental awareness, person to person contacts, working as a team, the information at workshops, and parents talking to parents as the most effective elements of the training. Other effective program elements which were identified included:

.Ability to tailor training to meet specific needs of individuals and groups.

.Training is a vehicle to enable communication across disciplines (parent, school staff, and agency personnel).

.Opportunity for parents to talk with other parents.

.Follow-up services.

.Use of parents of individuals with special needs as "mentors", and consultants.

.Opportunity for participants to recognize parents feelings related to coping.

.Opportunity for individualized transition planning.

.Video examples of successful programs.

.Parents empowered to become advocates for their children.

Question # 35

"What are your future plans for parent-professional collaborative training?" Most future plans depended on the continuation of funding. Seven (19%) planned to write grants for funding purposes. If funding were available, 12 (33%) of the projects would continue efforts and seek to expand services to local and/or state levels. Respondents reported that they would evaluate and refine their programs, provide more follow-up services, increase targeted under-represented populations and provide workshops for parents and teachers. They would provide more parent support activities and develop programs for parents to educate and sensitize professionals to issues that parents face in the transition process.

TABLE 1 Parent/Professional Training for Transition Survey Results N= 36

Question

| 1. Type of Transition training | 2. Participants at workshops | | | | | | | 3. Who conducts training? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School staff | Groups | Agency | Vocational | Parents | Students | Other | |
| Awareness activities/ lecture, small group discussion, application | 22 | 22 | 18 | 17 | 8 | 3 | 4 | Parents trained by professionals= 14 |
| Orientation meeting with individualized follow-up | | | | | | | | Parents trained by parents/professionals= 12 |
| One-to-one parent training | | | | | | | Employers= 2 | Parents trained by parents= 9 |
| Trainer of trainers model | | | | | | | Group home= 1 | |
| | | | | | | | Community people, i.e. lawyers, school board members= 1 | |

| Question<br>4. Who plans training? | 5. Level of training | 6. Length/schedule | 7. Topics |
|---|---|---|---|
| Professionals= 17<br><br>Professionals/ parents= 12<br><br>Parents= 5 | Awareness= 36<br><br>Knowledge= 35<br><br>Practice/ skill= 25<br><br>Implementation= 22 | Evenings= 16<br><br>Saturdays= 13<br><br>Weekdays= 13<br><br>2 day sessions= 2<br><br>Individual ongoing training= 2<br><br>One session= 26<br><br>Series= 11<br><br>Depended on interest/needs of participants= 7 | -Laws<br>-Local services<br>-Guardianship<br>-Rehabilitative services<br>-Advocacy<br>-Vocational opportunities<br>-ITP<br>-Community based training<br>-Special Education<br>-Define transition<br>-IEP process<br>-Communication skills<br>-Living opportunities<br>-Vocational assessment<br>-Pre-vocational training<br>-Special education assessment<br>-Emotional issues<br>-Leisure/recreation<br>-Accessing systems<br>-Supplemental Security Income<br>-Student self-advocacy and self-management<br>-Individual needs of participants<br>-Disability awareness<br>-Parents' high expectations<br>-Integration issues<br>-School placement<br>-Transportation<br>-Community resources<br>-Medical issues<br>-History of transition<br>-Interagency collaboration<br>-Instructional & behavioral techniques<br>-Group process<br>-Coping and processing skills<br>-Individualized family service plan |

| Question<br>8. Format | 9. Site | 10. Duration | | | | 11. Number served |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lecture= 21<br>Workshop= 17<br>Experimental= 11<br>One-on-One= 4<br>Other= 4 | Community= 28<br>School= 21<br>Private home= 11<br>Other= 2<br>(i.e. agency, university) | Less than 1 year<br>7 | 1-2 years<br>15 | 2-3 years<br>10 | 3 or more years<br>1 | Responses varied from 8 to 600 or more depending on structure of program. Due to these variables, responses could not be compared. |

| Question | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. Age group | | | | | | | 13. Types of Disability | 14. Geographical Area | | 15. Language |
| Infant | Pre-school | 6-13 years | 4-18 years | 19-22 years | 23 years and older | | All but gifted and talented= 15 | Rural | Urban | Suburban | Spanish= 12 |
| 13 | 15 | 18 | 32 | 33 | 17 | | Severe= 8 | 23 | 30 | 18 | (Signing Exact English)= 6 |
| Comprehensive (birth through adult)= 6 | | | | | | | All (learning disabled mentally retarded, visually impaired, hearing impaired, behaviorally disordered, orthopedically handicapped, gifted and talented, communicatively handicapped, multiply handicapped, "at risk" youth= 6 | | | | Native American Dialects= 3 |
| | | | | | | | Most categorical handicapped conditions= 8 | | | | Laotian= 1 |
| | | | | | | | All but gifted and talented "at risk"= 4 | | | | Vietnamese= 1 |
| | | | | | | | Mild= 3 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | "At risk" only= 1 (infant) | | | | |

| Question | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. Ethnicity | Economic status | Educational level | 17. Evaluation | 18. Strengths | Weaknesses |
| Caucasian= 35<br>Black= 18<br>Hispanic= 12<br>Asian= 11<br>Native American= 7<br>Russian= 1<br>French= 1 | Low= 20<br>Middle= 30<br>Upper= 12 | High school or less= 29<br>Post high school= 11 | Formal= 25<br>Informal= 17 | -Sponsors parents<br>-Understandable/usable information<br>-New information<br>-Opportunities to network<br>-Good topics<br>-Good presentations<br>-Communication training<br>-Diversity of participants<br>-Parent involvement<br>-Individual needs assessed<br>-IEP process<br>-Interagency contact & coordination<br>-Resources provided<br>-Parent mentor/ consultants<br>-Ongoing meetings<br>-Parents training other parents<br>-Materials & handouts<br>-Dialogue<br>-Feelings of support<br>-Speakers<br>-Good publicity<br>-Support groups as outcome<br>-Organized<br>-Community referrals<br>-Disabled speakers<br>-Down to earth/personal/ informal | -Failure unless local level involved<br>-Not enough time<br>-Too short<br>-Too long<br>-Information too technical/not useable<br>-How to involve lower income or minority parents<br>-Lack of formal evaluation<br>-Parents intimidated<br>-Awareness of lack of services presently available<br>-Low turnout<br>-Lack of needs assessment<br>-Parents who are dysfunctional<br>-Not enough information<br>-More individual attention during training<br>-More follow-up needed<br>-Push parents too much<br>-Staff not varied in ethnicity |

| Question<br>19. Follow-up | 20. Cost | 21. Effective § use | 22. Recruitment | Continuous involvement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Phone assistance= 19<br>One-on-one= 9<br>Additional training= 7<br>Coordinating/facilitating activities= 4<br>Referral= 3<br>Support groups= 3<br>Newsletter/mailings= 2<br>Technical assistance= 2<br>Case management= 2 | No cost to participants | Materials= 9<br>Travel= 7<br>Child care= 6<br>Speakers= 5<br>Staff salaries= 4<br>Release time= 3<br>Food= 3<br>Consultants= 2 | Phone calls= 17<br>(6 of these phone calls were parent to parent)<br>"Word of mouth"<br>News releases= 6<br>Newsletter= 5<br>Surveys= 3<br>Keeping student after school= 2<br>Release time given= 2<br>Brochures= 1<br>Provide transportation= 1 | Ongoing contact= 10<br>Newsletter= 4<br>Reminders= 4<br>Requirement of program= 3<br>Phone calls= 2<br>Articles= 2<br>Flyers= 1 |

| Question<br>23. Effect on parents | Effect on Students | Effect on professionals | 24. Outcomes | 25. Goals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Informed consumer= 12<br>Knowledge of services= 10<br>Aware of "after 22"= 7<br>Acquired strategies= 3<br>Getting services= 3<br>Felt supported= 2<br>More involved with special education= 1<br>Affected legislation= 1<br>More collaboration= 1<br>More involved with vocational education= 1<br>More involved with agencies= 1 | Getting services= 8<br>Graduates placed= 3<br>Knowledge of services= 2<br>Better IEP's= 2<br>Informed consumers= 1<br>Better access to services= 1 | Knowledge of services= 4<br>More information= 3<br>Aware of "after 22"= 2<br>Acquired strategies= 2<br>More involved with special education= 2<br>More collaboration= 2<br>Better prepared= 2<br>Change in curriculum= 1<br>More involved with vocational education= 1 | -Other parents found out<br>-Job coach program started<br>-Parent awareness<br>-Student working<br>-Parents became advocates<br>-Better agency cooperation<br>-Manual<br>-New pilot program<br>-Technical assistance<br>-Community contact<br>-Journal publication<br>-Presenters at conferences<br>-All more involved<br>-Believe more in handicapped employment potential<br>-Agency & organizational change<br>-Parent attitude change<br>-Disability awareness in schools<br>-More integrated site<br>-Parent groups | Awareness= 14<br>Plan or facilitate transition= 12<br>Action/change= 12<br>More information about adult services= 10<br>Train in skills= 5<br>Employ students= 3<br>Advocacy= 2<br>Integration= 2<br>Leadership= 2<br>Other:<br>-Networking<br>-Interagency agreements<br>-Technical assistance<br>-Infant transition |

| Question<br>26. Advisory board | Roles | Members | Benefit | 27. Planning strategies | Most Effective strategies | 28. Planning |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes No<br>21 15 | Advise= 7<br>Coordinate= 5<br>Work together= 5<br>Share information= 4<br>Policy= 3 | Parents= 21<br>Teachers= 15<br>Professionals= 15<br>Agency= 13<br>Employers= 10 | Planning= 13<br>Networking= 10<br>Other:<br>-Advocacy<br>-Clarifying procedures<br>-Defining roles<br>-Recruiting<br>-Disseminating information | Needs assessment= 19<br>Group planning= 14<br>Professional leadership= 8<br>Networking= 5<br>Sense of group= 4<br>Start with basics= 2<br>Collaboration with other agencies= 2<br>Adhered to grant guidelines= 2<br>Developed packets= 2<br>Materials previously developed= 2 | Needs assessment= 13<br>Group planning= 5<br>Networking= 3<br>Professional leadership= 1<br>*Not all programs responded to this part of the question | See question #4 |

| Question<br>29. Strategies during training | Most effective strategies | 30. Post training | 31. Parent input | 32. Other activities | 33. Importance to continuation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participation= 14<br>Discussion= 13<br>Lecture= 13<br>Small group= 11<br>Video= 9<br>Packets= 8<br>Overhead= 7<br>Role playing= 6<br>Other:<br>-Site visits<br>-Story telling/ personal sharing<br>-Question/answer<br>-Speakers<br>-Cooperative learning<br>-Action planning | Small group= 9<br>Participation= 8<br>Lecture= 4<br>Discussion= 3<br>Packets= 3<br>Discussion= 3 | See question #19 | Parent input in all categories= 21<br>No parent input= 2 | Classes= 29<br>Technical assistance= 28<br>Manual/handbooks= 27<br>Program referrals= 26<br>Newsletter= 24<br>ITP assistance= 24<br>Information= 22<br>Resources= 21<br>Support groups= 20<br>Other:<br>-Networking<br>-Community outreach<br>-Serving on school committees | Very important= 14<br>Vital= 8<br>Important= 8<br>Less important= 0<br>Not important= 0<br>N/A= 0 |

| Question<br><br>34. Most effective elements | | 35. Future plans |
|---|---|---|
| Parental awareness= 8<br><br>Person to person contact= 5<br><br>Parents talking to parents= 4<br><br>Working as a team= 4<br><br>Information at work-shops= 4<br><br>Sharing ideas= 3<br><br>Communication= 3<br><br>Meetings with individual= 2<br><br>Personal and extensive approach= 2 | Other strategies learned:<br>-Experiences tailored to groups<br>-Follow-up services<br>-Attitude shift<br>-Parent consultants/ mentors/volunteers<br>-Recognizing feelings<br>-Outreach/ more social approach to low socio-economic groups<br>-Parents empowered<br>-Video examples of successful programs | Continued efforts/expand to local and state levels= 12<br><br>Write grants/secure funding= 7<br><br>Network= 5<br><br>Write/disseminate materials= 4<br><br>Evaluate program/services= 4<br><br>Increase parent activity= 3<br><br>Parent/teacher workshops= 2<br><br>Other:<br>-Increase to serve learning or severely handicapped<br>-Parents with younger children<br>-Parents train professionals<br>-Parent transition handbook<br>-More focus on school to adult training<br>-More follow-up<br>-Train trainers<br>-Address transition even more<br>-Recreation/leisure<br>-Parent support |

## ESSENTIAL STRATEGIES FOR EFFECTIVE TRAINING

The essential strategies delineated below were derived from the analysis of the survey data collected from 36 parent/professional training programs throughout the United States. It is strongly recommended that these strategies are incorporated into the development of parent/professional collaborative training for transition programs.

1. Individualize training to meet the needs of each group of parent/professionals by conducting a needs assessment before planning the training and/or at the beginning of the actual training. The needs assessment will be most effective if it is done on a one-to-one basis either on the telephone, in person, or at a meeting of the organization. Flyers, questionnaires, and mailers have not been as successful as the aforementioned methods in collecting the information required to appropriately serve a group of parents and professionals. The needs assessment should include items regarding the content of the training, process of training, the participates in the training, etc. (See Appendix B for a Sample Needs Assessment.) A modified needs assessment may also need to be conducted at the beginning of the training with individuals who actually attend the initial workshops. Ask participants to discuss their expectations from the training.

2. The planning team should include representatives from each group of people to be trained. For example, if agency personnel are to take part in the training, an individual from the agency should be part of the planning team. Members of the planning team could also come from parents groups, community organizations, medical and social service organizations, siblings, etc. In order to establish "ownership" of the training program, and subsequently to ensure follow-up , local personnel must take part in the planning. Every member of the planning team should be involved in selecting or deciding upon all aspects of planning, materials to be used, facilities, times, methods, etc. With the emphasis on collaboration, parents and professionals must be treated with financial and role equity (i.e., if professionals are paid, parents should also be paid for their consultation time). Additionally, if large state-wide training programs are being planned, state level agency personnel should be included.

3. Plans for the training should be based on the needs assessment. After reviewing the results of the needs assessment, the planning team will decide on the time, day(s), place, content, format, and services (i.e., childcare, transportation, food) which will be provided at the training sessions.

4. Training programs which take participants beyond an awareness level to the level of implementation are more likely to effect change in participants. Initial training sessions tend to be at an awareness level, allowing for an initial exposure to transition information. Effective means for "implementation" training include: a) one-to-one follow-up to assist parents and professionals with specific situations, b) the establishment of support groups of parents and professionals which develop as a result of "awareness" training, c) a series of trainings from awareness to implementation.

5. Parents and professionals should be recruited to attend training sessions through local parent and professional networking. Announcements in newsletters, newspapers, and public service announcements are generally not as effective as one-to-one contact, telephone and/or personal letters, or "word-of-mouth" at parent and professional meetings. Advertising the dates of meetings well in advance is effective. Providing child care, transportation, reimbursing expenses and/or providing food may be an incentive for some participants. Parents and professionals will make arrangements to attend if they know dates and times well in advance, and if the training has been planned to meet their needs.

6. In order to reach under-represented populations, identify the demographic features of the population in terms of ethnicity, languages spoken, socio-economic-status, and marital status. Include representatives from each group in the recruitment, planning, and implementation of the training. One-to-one contact as opposed to workshops is the most effective way to reach under-represented families. Assessment of their needs is critical, particularly in terms of what type of training is most appropriate, the need for translation of materials, and interpreters. Individualized follow-up is also crucial for these families.

7. Design workshops which include: a) presenters and workshop facilitiers who demonstrate a positive attitude toward parent participation (i.e., acknowledge and value the expertise and participation of parents in the transition process); b) a variety of activities and techniques which encourage small group information exchange and active audience participation. For example:

*Role playing

*Story telling

*Personal video tapes

*Developing Action Plans

*Small group problem solving

It should be noted that for some parents workshops are not a viable option; therefore it is important to provide alternative means for involvement such as receiving information in the mail, a visit by another parent, assistance in program referral.

6. Plan to provide follow-up activities/services if the goal of the training is to effect changes in parent/professional behaviors. Follow-up activities are necessary to ensure ongoing parent involvement and to reinforce training goals. A variety of follow-up techniques which will meet the specific needs of local parents and community members should be offered. It seems that the most effective technique is one-to-one contact ( in person or via telephone). Other techniques utilized to maintain contact with parents and professionals who participate in trainings were:

*Support groups

*Classes and further trainings

*Newsletters

*Information packets

*"action plans"

*Manuals and handbooks

*Technical assistance (T.A.)

*Community outreach

*Program referrals

Projects did not offer formal workshops as follow-up activities because they were rarely requested by the local parents.

9. Develop materials (handbooks, action plans, etc.) appropriate for the individuals who participate in the training sessions. Materials must be selected carefully so as not to overwhelm participants with bulk or technical jargon. Include a glossary of terms and lists of local agencies and resources.

10. Establish an advisory board. Advisory boards are most effective if they are diverse in membership and represent the parent population (i.e., ethnicity, income and education level, and language) as well as the professional population (agencies and systems). Roles of advisory board members may include: advising, coordinating, sharing information, deciding policy and recruiting parents. The one-to-one contact recommended for recruiting parents and follow-up may be conducted by members of the advisory board.

11. Sensitize professionals to parents' needs, frustrations, and concerns and sensitize parents to professionals' needs, frustrations, and concerns. Some parents do not feel comfortable assuming the role of advocate. Alternative means for these parents to ensure that their rights and their children's rights are upheld must be presented to parents and professionals. Suggestions as to how to select an advocate, who is available to advocate, and knowledge of the most important characteristics of an advocate are helpful to parents and professionals who do not feel comfortable assuming the role of advocate.

12. Write a grant or seek local financial assistance to provide training for specific populations (i.e., request monies to translate materials, to provide interpreters at training sessions, and to support continuing transition training activities).

## UNIQUE STRATEGIES

The following strategies were unique to a small number of effective training programs. These strategies may be appropriate for many situations and are included here for your consideration.

1. Include students in the training program. Some students were taught to be advocates for themselves. The students were trained with the parents and professionals. (Disabled in Action of Baltimore, Inc.- Baltimore, MD).

2. Hire members of under-represented populations to act as outreach staff to conduct one-to-one contact with families from their population. These individuals need to have the time, the patience, and the communication skills required to build trust with the families. They need to learn to assess the family's specific needs and comfort level with a variety of methods of preparing parents to take part in the collaborative process. (SPIN - State-wide Parent Information Network - Boston, MA).

3. Include group home personnel and other care providers in training programs. Assessment of local needs may suggest a need for training of foster parents and/or professionals in group homes who are responsible for more than one child/young adult. (Community Transition Project - San Francisco, CA).

4. Give parent trainers a specified amount of money to spend as they judge most appropriate for a given training. Parents and professionals work as teams in local areas and each team utilizes its budget to best meet the assessed needs of the local population. (Parent Education Network - Tampa, FL).

5. Consider family weekend training. In one program, training was held throughout a weekend with the entire family taking part. Child care and activities for children and young adults were available. This gave the parents and professionals an opportunity to work, play, and socialize together. (Families Together, Topeka, KS).

6. Develop an "action plan" during the training which requires a follow-up meeting or activity (either a telephone call or a small group meeting). These plans facilitate parent/professional collaboration and they also provide the opportunity for continued involvement in student transitions. (University of Washington- Seattle, WA).

7. Pay parents to attend a series of training sessions. (Regional Institute to Facilitate Transition for Children and Adolescents with Special Needs - Bakersfield, CA).

## References


Darling, R. B. (1983). Parent-professional interaction: The roots of misunderstanding. In M. Seligman (Ed.), The Family with a Handicapped Child: Understanding and Treatment. N.Y.: Grune and Straton.

Goodall, P., and Bruder, M. (1986). Parents and the transition process The Exceptional Parent, April, 22-28.

Halloran, W., Thomas, M., Snauwaert, D. and De Stefano, L. (1987). Imminent considerations in transition service delivery. Interchange, 7 (3), University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, 1-5.

Hegenauer, J., Marinoble, R., Reifman, L., and Patton, P. (1985). Transition from school to work: A guide for parents of learning disabled youth. Unpublished manuscript.

Horton, B,. Maddox, M., and Edgar, E., (1984). Adult transition model: Planning for post-school services. Bellevue, WA: Edmark Publishing.

Moon, M. S., and Beale, A. (1984). Vocational training and employment guidelines for parents. Exceptional Parent, 7,(1).

National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth (1983). Proceedings from the 1983 National parent group round table. Washington, DC.

Rusch, F., and Phelps, L. (1987). Secondary education and transition from school to work: A national priority. Exceptional Children, 53 (6), 487-492.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., and Barcus, J. (1985). From school to work: A vocational transition model for handicapped students. Exceptional Children. 52, 25-37.

Will, M. (1984). Bridges from school to working life: Programs for the handicapped. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. March/April, (2), 1.

project no.: ____

Appendix A. Survey Form

Parent-Professional Collaborative Training for Transition Survey

Is the name of the project, phone number, contact person and address on the program description sheet correct?

1. What type of transition training with parents and professionals do you do?

2. If you do workshops, who are the participants:
   Parents, only
   School staff
   Agency personnel
   Vocational education staff
   Students/children
   Other
   Trained in groups, (which groups):

3. If you do transition training, who conducts the training for:
   Parents-

   Professionals ( what type of professionals)-

   Groups-

4. Who planned the training?

5. At what level would you describe your training?
   Awareness
   Knowledge
   Practice/skill acquisition
   Implementation

6. What is the length of training and the most effective time schedule for training? ( days, weeks, months )

7. Which are the transition areas/topics addressed. ( e.g. laws, agencies, individualized transition plans)

8. How is it conducted?
   Lecture ___
   Workshop ___
   Experiential training ___
   Other

9. Where was the training held?

10 How long has your program been in existence?

11. How many parents/professionals have you trained in total?
   How many each year?

12. What age groups does this training effect?
   Infant-
   Pre-school -
   6-13 years _
   14-18 years _
   19-22 years _
   22 years and above _

13. What types of youth does this training effect?
   Mentally retarded ___
   Visually impaired ___
   Learning disabled ___
   Deaf/hard of hearing ___
   Behavior disordered ___
   O.H., Other health impaired ___
   Gifted/talented ___
   Communicatively handicapped ___
   Multiply handicapped ___
   At risk youth ___
   Other, please specify-

14.What is your geographical area?
Rural ___
Urban ___
Suburban ___

15.Are the trainings offered in any languages other than English?

16.Could you describe the ethnic, economic, and educational background of the participants?
Ethnic -

Economic -

Educational background -

17. Do you conduct an evaluation of each training?
Formal -
Informal -

18. Based on the evaluation data from parents and professionals, what were the strengths and weaknesses of your program?
Strengths:

Weaknesses:

19.Were there any follow-up activities?
Yes ___
No ___
Describe

20.How much did the training cost?
What did the money pay for (e.g. stipends, release time, materials, facilities, child care, transportation)?

21. What was the most effective use of your dollar, i.e. providing child care? tranportation? other?

22.How did you get people to come to the training and how do you keep them involved?

23.What do you think the effect of the training was on the:
Parents?

Students?

Professionals?

24.What observable outcomes have you noticed?

25.What were the goals of your transition program?

To what extent have you met those goals?

26.Do you have a transition advisory board?
What is their role?

Who makes up the board?

How did having a board help?

27. Describe the strategies that you used in planning for the training?

Which were the most effective?

28.Who is/was responsible for the planning?

29. Describe the strategies used during the training, i.e. instructional techniques, media?

Which were the most effective?

30. Describe any post-training strategies that you used?

Which were the most effective?

31. What kind of parent input did you have for:
planning-

materials-

facilitating/leading-

evaluations-

presenting-

participation during training-

32.What other activities/services do you provide for parents and professionals? Please describe any that you do provide:

Information gathering

Individual transition planning

Classes/workshops

Providing resources ( what type )

Technical assistance

Information or program referral

Parent support groups

Information dissemination which focuses on transition

Newsletter

Manuals/handbooks

other

33. How important do you feel that these activities are/have been in continuing the transition effort started by the parent/professional training?

34. What do you consider to be the most effective elements of the transition training?

35. What are your future plans for parent professional collaborative training for transition?

## Appendix B. Sample Needs Assessment

We are thinking of conducting workshops to train parents and professionals to collaboratively assess transition of handicapped children and youth from agencies to schools and schools to agencies. We would like your input as we develop these workshops.

1. Who should participate in the training workshops?

   parents
   special education teachers
   employers
   students
   vocational education teachers
   regular education teachers
   administrators
   agency personnel
   medical and related service personnel
   others

2. Where should the training be held?

   school
   community  church  library
   agency
   private home
   other

3. What would you like to training to teach you?

   awareness of transition between and agencies
   knowledge about how to do transition
   practice in how to do transition
   advanced skills like advocating for services

4. What topics would you like addressed at the training?

   laws
   guardianship
   advocacy
   special education
   IEP process
   group process
   school placement
   SSI
   transportation
   medical issues
   coping skills
   leisure/recreation
   integration
   procedural services
   training for work
   other

   social services
   rehabilitation services
   vocational opportunities
   define transition
   communication skills
   vocational assessment
   individualized transition plans
   community based training
   community resources
   adult living opportunities
   vocational assessment
   student self-advocacy and self-management
   disability awareness
   infant services
   interagency collaboration

5. When would you like the training held?

after school
weekends
weekdays
1-3 hour sessions
one day training workshop
ongoing meetings

6. What age child do you want the training to address?

infant
pre-school
grade school age
secondary school age
19-22 years
22 years and above

7. What language would you like the training given in?

English
Spanish
Vietnamese
Laotian
Signing Exact English
American Sign Language
other

8. What type of training would you like?

individual or small group meetings at my or another home
group workshop
material in the mail
phone contact and assistance
support group meetings

9. Who would you like to have contact you and how?

other parent
teacher
program coordinator or staff
phone call
information in the mail
information sent home from school

10. Would you like us to also provide the following?

classes with further information on specific topics
IEP/ITP assistance
consultation
handbook on transition
assistance in identifying and referral to programs
support groups
phone assistance
case management assistance

11. In order for you to be able to attend the training, would you need:

child care
transportation
no cost workshops
free materials
other

12. Would you be willing to help us in:

giving us ideas in planning the training
reviewing materials we will use
presenting at the training
evaluating the training
assisting with small groups
serving on an advisory committee
volunteer work

## Appendix C. Survey Participants

Alabama

Title of Program: Special Education Action Committee of Alabama

Name: Judy Dilleber

Address: P.O. Box 66112
Mobile, Alabama 36660-1112

Phone #: (205) 478-1208

Nature of Program: Provides help to parents who have children ages 0-3 preschool, very little on school to life but they do cover it if a parent asks for help

Population served: 0-3 years of age and some 3-21

Collaboration: Parents train parents

Type of Transition: Hospital to home, home to pre-school or other programs, and school to life

Arkansas

Title of Program: Western Arkansas Educational Cooperation

Name: Cathy Williams

Address: Rt.#1 Box 126
Branch, Arkansas 72928

Phone #: (501) 965-2191

Nature of Program: Information on adult services, service agencies, IEPs, IWPs, curriculum and parent packets. Local action plan developed by interagency team for implementing 8 essential elements of process: Vocational assessment, pre- voc. skills, voc. training, work experience, employment linkage, written plan, parent training, follow-up

Population served: Some 8th grades, mostly 10-12th grade for mild to moderately disabled youths

Collaboration: Professionals train parents and teachers. Joint project of Special Ed., Voc. Ed. , and Voc. Rehab.. (teachers should train parents)

Type of Transition: Primarily vocational transitions

Arizona

Title of Program: Pilot Parents

Name: Mary Slaughter

Address: 3003 N. Central #100
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Phone #: (602) 271-4012

Nature of Program: Support groups for transition: rights and responsibilities

Population served: Anyone who attends special education or schools for disabled

Collaboration: Volunteers train parents

Type of Transition: Parents dealing with any type of transition in school

Title of Program: Project Origins

Name: James S. Gittings
University of Arizona
Division of Special Education
College of Education and Archeology

Address: University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

Phone #: (602) 621-7822

Nature of Program: Helping parents to integrate their youngsters into a work training program, 4 workshops

Population served: Severely mentally retarded and multi-handicapped secondary education students

Collaboration: Director of Pilot Parents trains parents in seminars

Type of Transition: School to work

California

Title of Program: Community Transitional Services Project

Name: Stacy Graff

Address: 1640 Holloway Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94132

Phone #: (415) 469-6393

Nature of Program: Transition and vocational information and decision making team in two high schools giving information to parents

Population served: Severely handicapped in secondary education

Collaboration: Professionals work informally with parents

Type of Transition: School to work, life, and community

Title of Program: Cooperative Model for Planning and Developing Transitional Services

Name: Joe Passanella

Address: 723 East Cota St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Phone #: (805) 963-4331

Nature of Program: Training and manual given on transitions from school to life and ITP's

Population served: Handicapped students exiting schools

Collaboration: Teachers train parents

Type of Transition: Leaving school for work, community, or life

Title of Program: Employment Retention Program

Name: Cory Ross

Address: Employment Retention Program
Special Services Division
2465 Dolan Way
San Pablo, CA 94806

Send survey to: Cory Ross
3038 Simas Ave.
Pinole, CA 94564

Phone #: (415) 724-4657

Nature of Program: Information, counseling, support group

Population served: Any PL94-142 students aged 17-22 exiting the school system

Collaboration: Teams training parents (teams: from undergrad students to those holding a Masters degree )

Type of Transition: School to work or change of residence

Title of Program: Crossmont Union High School District
Crossmont Work Training Center

Name: Glen Maxion

Address: 230 Jamacha Rd.
El Cajon, CA 92020

Phone #: (619) 442-0606

Nature of Program: (Travel training, recreation) 219 severely handicapped and deaf-blind students, with the goal of successfully transitioning students from school to common work and quality adult life. Strong inservice toward that goal

Population served: Severely handicapped students aged 18-22 who are within 1-2 years of leaving the school system

Collaboration: Parent/Professional training teams

Type of Transition: School to work, community, or home

Title of Program: Project Work

Name: Dr. Ian Pumpian

Address: 6310 Alvarado Ct.
San Diego, CA 92182

Phone #: (619) 229-2462

Nature of Program: Training on information, awareness and advocacy agencies

Population served: All handicapped children falling under the PL94-142

Collaboration: Parent and parent/professional training teams

Type of Transition: Mostly school to adulthood and integrated work settings

Title of Program: Solano County Integration Project
Solano County Regional Occupation Center

Name: Blair Roger

Address: 712 Waller St.
San Francisco, CA 94117

Phone #: (415) 621-0752

Nature of Program: To provide a bridge of information for the parents of children who are going from a segregated to an integrated school setting

Population served: All severely handicapped 0-22 yrs. and older

Collaboration: Parents training with school and resource staff. also parents co-training in a regular school setting with professionals

Type of Transition: From segregated school settings to integrated school settings

Title of Program: Whittier Union High School District
Career Assessment and Placement Center

Name: Dan Hulbert

Address: 9401 S. Painter Ave.
Whittier, CA 90605

Phone #: (213) 698-8121

Nature of Program: The Career Assessment and Placement Center provides and coordinates career, vocational and social development and integration of persons with disabilities into the community

Population served: Mild to severely handicapped middle school to 22; adult supported work/life program

Collaboration: Professionals train parents, then professional/parent teams train parents with parent information, sharing, and networking as focus

Type of Transition: School to work, community, and home

Colorado

Title of Program: Parent Education and Assistance for Kids (PEAK)

Name: Barbara Buswell or Judy Martz, Co-directors

Address: 3709 East Platte Suite #101
Colorado Springs, CO 80909

Phone #: (303) 574-2345

Nature of Program: Provide parents with information and skills so they can obtain increased and improved services (education, medical, and community) for their children; promote positive communication between parents and professionals

Population served: 0-21 yrs

Collaboration: Parents train parents, (it's a working relationship with providers and state agencies)

Type of Transition: Hospital to home, home to pre-school or agencies, home to school, and school to adult services

Florida

Title of Program: Parent Education Network

Name: Mary Jetton, I&R CO-ND, Jackie Sipple, President

Address: 2215 East Henry Ave.
Tampa, FL 33610

Phone #: (813) 239-1179

Nature of Program: Funded by a federal grant to do parent training and develop information packets for libraries and parents

Population served: Exceptional students covered by (PL99-457) PL94-142, 0-21 years old

Collaboration: Professionals train parents to train parents

Type of Transition: Home to school, in school, school to life and community

Title of Program: Parents to Parents of Florida

Name: Susan Duwa

Address: 621 Kraft Ave.
Panama City, FL 32401

Phone #: (904) 769-6606

Nature of Program: Parent support, information concerning transitions from birth through adult

Population served: 0-5, all pre-school aged children

Collaboration: Parents/professionals to parents

Type of Transition: Any crisis/transition

Indiana

Title of Program: Indiana Parent Training Program- Task Force on Education for the Handicapped

Name: Judy Alderton

Address: 812 E. Jefferson
South Bend, IN 46617

Phone #: (219) 234-7101

Nature of Program: Pre-school, school, post-school training for parents of children with special needs. Services are mandatory in Indiana for 5-18 yr. olds

Population served: Parents of handicapped persons

Collaboration: Parent to parent training and parent/professional team training parents

Type of Transition: In school and post-school

Kansas

Title of Program: Bureau of Child Research

Name: Ann Turnbull

Address: University of Kansas
Hayworth Hall
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Phone #: (913) 864-4295 or 864-4954

Nature of Program: Manuals, workshops, financial training, social/community/residential/employment planning

Population served: Students with cognitive limitations, including head injured

Collaboration: Professional staff train parents
Note: many of the professionals are either siblings or parents themselves with handicapped children

Type of Transition: Transitions into adulthood and lifestyle

Title of Program: Families Together

Name: Patty Gerdel or Barbara Huff

Address: P.O. Box 86153
Topeka, Kansas 66686

Phone #: (913)273-6343

Nature of Program: To provide awareness training and information on agencies They have mini/enrichment sessions and 2 semi-annual camping retreats (35 families participate). They explain the 2 year pre-graduation preparation process

Population served: All children falling under PL94-142

Collaboration: Professionals train parents initially, then parents train parents

Type of Transition: Graduation process which leads students into school to life, agency availability, and job opportunities

Kentucky

Title of Program: Parents Plus

Name: Karen Stone

Address: Kentucky Coalition For Career and Leisure Development
366 Waller Ave.
Lexington, KY 40504

Phone #: (606)278-4712

Nature of Program: Training program. Transition (L.I.F.T.) Life In Full Training Awareness. Understanding My Child's Educational Rights (U.M.C.E.R.) What will happen when I die? Adaptive toys and devices

Population served: 0-life (some over 60 even), all ages but transition services are mostly for students 14 years old and older

Collaboration: Parents/professionals teams train parents

Type of Transition: Work place, living arrangements, leisure/recreation

Louisiana

Title of Program: Employer Sponsored Education Project

Name: Brenda Baron

Address: LA State Dept. of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064

Phone #: (504) 342-0167

Nature of Program: Information on types of transitions

Population served: Severely handicapped

Collaboration: Professionals/Parents train parents

Type of Transition: Pre-school to school and school to adult transitions

Title of Program: Non-Directed Demonstration Project
Louisiana State University Medical Center
School of Allied Health Professionals

Name: Ann Riall

Address: Human Development Center
1100 Florida Ave. Bldg. #119
New Orleans, LA 70112

Phone #: (504)942-8200

Nature of Program: To help in the transition young mothers are making from the hospital to the home; information, counseling, and workshops are provided

Population served: Usually young, black, low income mothers with children with severe neurological dysfunctions

Collaboration: Professionals training parents

Type of Transition: Birth, hospital to home, and home to pre-school and community programs

Title of Program: Project Prompt
U.S. Department of Education

Name: Sharon Duda

Address: 1500 Edwards Ave. Suite #0
Harahan, LA 70123

Phone #: (504) 734-7736

Nature of Program: Review of goals, IEP process, rights and responsibilities in the least restrictive environment, informing parents of their rights in P.L.94-142, teaching parents to be full partners in their child's I.E.P. process, showing them that they are the experts on their children

Population served: All students falling under PL94-142

Collaboration: Parents train parents

Type of Transition: All from 0-21 yrs. old

Maryland

Title of Program: Disabled in Action Of Baltimore, Inc.

Name: Dr. Martin Gould

Address: 3000 Chestnut Ave.
Suite # 204
Baltimore, MD 21211

Phone #: (301)235-1403

Nature of Program: To provide information, awareness, direct experience, and skills

Population served: Secondary aged severely handicapped youth

Collaboration: Professionals/advocates/consultants train parents

Type of Transition: School to life

Massachusetts

Title of Program: Action for Boston Community Development Inc.

Name: Sandra Cuppett

Address: 178 Tremont St.
Boston, MA 02111

Phone #: (617) 357-6000 ext. 370

Nature of Program: Community-based skills training conducted in natural setting, small group or on an individual basis. Conducted after-school, weekends, and in the summer

Population served: 14-21 year old severely handicapped youth (primarily with physical disabilities), from low-income families

Collaboration: Collaboration between the agency (which is a community-based social services agency), state vocational rehabilitation, the school department, and local Centers for Independent Living

Type of Transition: School to life, (all females)

Title of Program: Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Boston University

Name: Dr. Doreen Bardon

Address: Boston University, Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
University Hall
Boston, MA 02215

Phone #: (617)353-3720

Nature of Program: Parent involvement in IEPs, school, rights, information

Population served: Students who are 14-22 years of age who are served by P.L.94-142

Collaboration: Professionals training parents

Type of Transition: Parent training

Title of Program: SPIN = State Wide Parent Information Network

Name: Nicole Higgins

Address: 310 Stuart St.,
Boston, MA 02116

Phone #: (617) 482-2915

Nature of Program: Information, training on life transitions

Population served: All special needs, from birth to adulthood

Collaboration: Parents train parents

Type of Transition: Early childhood to school, entry into vocational education for graduation, exit from school and school to adult world

Minnesota

Title of program: Lakeview School/Parent Open House
Intermediate School District

Name: Jane Peterson, Project Director
Sandra Thompson, Transition Facilitator

Address: 1120 West County Rd., B,
Roseville, MN 55113

Phone #: (612) 487-1642, 633-4531

Nature of Program: Information about adult services, planning for adult life

Population served: 27 families of secondary aged students with moderate and severe mental retardation. (In 1987-88, 41 families will be served and the number of families to be served will increase each year thereafter.)

Collaboration: School staff and adult service providers working with families

Type of Transition: School to adult life

[redacted]

Title of Program: Project Reach
University of Southern Mississippi

Name: Barbara Campbell

Address: University of Southern Mississippi
ED-Developmental Educational Programs
Southern Station Box 5163
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5163

Phone #: (601) 266-5163

Nature of Program: To assist families with transitions in medical maintenance

Population served: 0 to 3 years of age

Collaboration: Birth to home

Type of Transition: Medical transitions

[redacted]

Title of Program: Montana Center for Handicapped Children
Parents: Let's Decide for Kids.

Name: Katherine Dalton

Address: 1500 North 30th St.
Billings, MT 59101-0298

Phone #: (406) 657-2311

Nature of Program: Classroom, rights, planning the future as well as IEPs, rights classroom, and social

Population served: Handicapped persons from birth throughout life span

Collaboration: 0 to person team (3 parents/3 professionals)

Type of Transition: All

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

New York

Title of Program: New York Parents Cooperative/New York City Parents Coalition for the Education Advocated for Children

Name: Joan Harrington

Address: 24-16 Bridge Plaza So.
Long Island City, N.Y. 11101

Phone #: (718) 729-8866

Nature of Program: Advocacy/parent training in transition planning, adult services in New York City

Population served: Developmentally disabled youths aged 16-21

Collaboration: Professionals training parents

Type of Transition: School to community, home and work

Title of Program: Parents Information Group/Exceptional Children of New York

Name: Deborah Olson

Address: 215 Seconds St.
Syracuse, N.Y. 13210

Phone #: (315) 478-0804

Nature of Program: Provide information on rights and education for all handicapped children through workshops, presentations, and one to one assistance

Population served: All children covered by PL 94-142

Collaboration: Parent-to-parent

Type of Transition: All school phases

Ohio

Title of: National Center for Research in Vocational Education

Name: Margarethe Imse

Address: 1960 Kenny Rd.
Ohio State Universeity
Columbus, OH 43210

Phone #: (800) 848-4815

Nature of Program: Interagency agreements, individual transition phases, assisting parents with schools and work. Fifteen, 1 hour seminars, research guides

Population served: Mildly handicapped students aged 14-21

Collaboration: Team of parents/professionals/educators train parents

Type of Transition: School to work

Oregon

Title of Program: Oregon C.O.P.E.Project, Inc.

Name: Cheron Haythall, Ph.D.

Address: 999 Locust NE, #42
Salem, OR 97303

Phone #: (503) 373-7477

Nature of Program: Transition curriculum, rights on information and responsibilities, and information gathering

Population served: Parents of children with disabilities, birth-22 years old and professionals serving these families

Collaboration: Parents train parents

Type of Transition: School to work, community, and life

Washington

Title of Program: Technical Assistance for Parents (TAP)

Name: Joanne Butts

Address: 6316 South 12th St.
Tacoma, WA 98465

Phone #: (206) 565-2266

Nature of Program: Information support workshops

Population served: Parents of handicapped children 0-22 years old falling under 94-142 bill

Collaboration: Parents to parents (depends on the transition and the group involved)

Type of Transition: Home to school and school to work or life

Title of Program: University of Washington

Name: Gene Edgar

Address: EEU, WJ10
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Phone #: (206) 543-4011

Nature of Program: 3 programs:
#1= Early childhood programs
#2= Adult to work
#3= Judicated Youth

Population served: #1= (1= 2 phases, Birth to 3 years, and 3= to 6 or school.)
#2= 18-25 old
#3= Handicapped offenders

Collaboration: #1= Parents as planning/training teams
#2= Professionals train parents on how to find leads after school
#3= Parole officers work with parents on attitudes and communication, options and obligations

Type of Transition: #1= birth to programs, or 3= school
#2= adolescent to work or life
#3= adjudication to society, home or school

Program manuals are available commercially through Edmark Publication Co., Bellevue, Washington.

Appendix D. Survey Non- Participants

Title of Program: North Bay Regional Center *
Name: Travis Lipscomb
Address: 2351 Mendocino Ave.
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
Phone #:(707) 528-6161

Title of Program: Gadsden County School Board **
(also known as the Rural Community Interagency
Collaboration Effort)
Name: Becky Pruett
Address:818 Box
Quincy, FL 32351
Phone #:(904)627-9651

Title of Program: Project Bridge *
Name:Patricia Spencer
Address:P.O. Box 927
Elk Grove, IL 60009-0927
Phone #:(312) 981-7382

Title of Program: Interact *
Name:William Sharpton
Address:University of New Orleans
Department of Special Education and
Habilitative Services
New Orleans, LA 70148
Phone #:(504) 286-6609

Title of Program: Louisiana Department of Education*
Special Education Deptment
Name: Nancy Hicks
Address:P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
Phone #: (504) 342-6118

Title of Program:PLANS ( Planned Linkages **
Among Needed Services )
Name:Charles McNally
Address:United Cerebral Palsy Association, PG County
3901 Woodhaven Lane
Bowie, MD 20715
Phone #:(301) 262- 4993

Title of Program: Family Planning- Education/Training **
Name:Jennifer Wolfum or Adella Hill
Address:178 Fremont St.
Boston, MA 02111
Phone #:(617)357-6000 ext.#393

Title of Program: United Cerebral Palsy Association- **
Metro Detroit Community Service Deptment
Name:Beverly McConnell
Address: 17000 West 8 Mile Rd.
Suite 380
Southfield, MI 48075
Phone #:(313) 557-5070

Title of Program: PACER Center- Parents Helping Parents *
Name:Paula Goldberg
Address:4826 Chicago Ave South
Minneapolis, MN 55417-1055
Phone #:(612)827-2966

Title of Program: Educational Innovations - Special Education Bureau *
Name:Carol Davis or Stephanie Powers
Address:1 Eagle Square , Suite 512
Concord, NH 03330
Phone #:(603) 472-5821

Title of Program: Association de Padres Pro Biene- *
Star Ninos Impedidos De Puerto Rico
Name:Carmine Se'llas
Address:Box 21301 Rio Piebras
Puerto Rico, 00928
Phone #:(809) 765-0345

* information unavailable

**program did not address transition (but may have done parent/professional training)

**Addendum: Information from the following programs was received too late to include in the survey results**

Title of Program: Parents' Graduation Alliance

Name: Roz Slovic

Address: 135 Education Ave.
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Phone#: (503) 686-5311

Nature of Program: Provide information and leads on the services available. A vision for quality services (high school, residential, vocational) and strategies for change or improvement when necessary.

Population served: Youth who are secondary age and severely handicapped, and their families.

Collaboration: Parent to parent

Type of Transition: School to adult services

Title of Program: Parents Helping Parents

Name: Florene Poyadue R.N., M.A., M.F.C.C.

Address: 535 Race St. #220
San Jose, CA 95126

Phone: (408) 288-5010

Nature of Program: A resource center for parents and professionals which offers information, peer counseling, training, a visiting parents program, family rap sessions, IEP trainings, and programs for siblings

Population served: Parents and professionals who serve children and young adults with disabilities

Collaboration: Parent to parent training for counseling and support through transition

Type of Transition: Hospital to home, in school, school to work

Title of Program: Regional Institute to Facilitate Transition for Children and Adolescents with Special Needs

Name: Dr. Michal Clark, Dr. Renuka Sethi

Address: Kern Regional Center
501 40th St.
Bakersfield, CA 93301

California State University of Bakersfield
Department of Education
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Phone: (805) 327-8531
(805) 833-2219

Nature of Program: A regional institute consisting of a series of 3 workshops for parents and professionals

Population served: 30 families participated, each family receiving a stipend of $40.00.

Collaboration: Workshops were planned and facilitated by parent/professional teams and topics discussed included issues related to due process, parent involvement, and practices in the least restrictive environment. A video tape highlighting the workshop format and experts from the training as well as a directory of regional services are available.

Type of Transition: school to adult services